

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 6-10, 16, 17, 19, 21-31 and 33 are currently pending.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rodefer et al. (Rodefer), U.S. Publication No. 2003/0120779 A1.

Claims 1-2, 6, 10, 16, 19, 22-24, 26, 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al. (Bates), U.S. Patent No. 6,990,494 B2, in view of Smith et al. (Smith), U.S. 6,742,033 B1, and further in view of Rodefer.

Claims 7, 17, 21, 25, 27, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates, Smith, and Rodefer as applied to claims 1, 10, 22, and 30 above, and further in view of Berstis, U.S. Patent No. 6,182,122 B1.

Claims 8 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates, Smith, and Rodefer as applied to claims 1 and 22 above, in view of Berstis, and further in view of Martin et al. (Martin), U.S. Patent No. 5,867,706.

§102 Rejections

Claim 9

The office action rejected this claim under 35 USC 102 (e) as being anticipated by Rodefer et al. (US Pub No 2003/0120779), and states that Rodefer discloses a method of displaying webpages in a single web browser instance [0040].

Rodefer discloses displaying multiple webpages, he fails to disclose operating on the web pages (as claim 9 requires), let alone operating on them independently without altering the state of another of said at least first and second fully functional webpages. The multi-view system as discussed by Rodefer does not result in fully functional webpages. Aside from paragraphs [0037] and [0040], Rodefer never again discusses a functionality that displays multiple webpages - the remainder of his disclosure being devoted to other functionalities. For the most part, his disclosure addresses previewing webpages as described in [0018] and [0058] in 2003/0120779, and never mentions operating on web pages.

In paragraph [0058] he states:

"... When the user clicks a result (136), the page is displayed in the preview area (134)."

Thus, Rodefer teaches *previewing* webpages in static frames and not operating on them. His disclosure is therefore incomplete with regard to teaching the instant invention, and in fact teaches a different functionality than applicant's - that of previewing webpages. In this regard, Rodefer teaches a paradigm much like that of Applicant's figure 5 describing prior art.

To clarify that the web-pages are fully operable, applicant's claim 9 has been amended to include: "...displaying and operating on webpages..." The elements of applicant's claim 9 already included this requirement: "... fully functional webpages may be operated on independently..."

Also, when Rodefer discusses displaying multiple webpages in paragraph [0040], he states:

"...multiple target sites referred to in any search results would also be loaded and opened (the user choosing the number of results sites to load/open, example: "first 5" or "first 10")."

As such it is apparent that Rodefer never visualized how multiple webpages would appear if displayed in individual browser frames within a single browser window. Contrary to this discussion, in applicant's figures 10, 11, and 12, the designed number of webpages being displayed is tiled into the rectangular screen area in a regular manner and in substantially equal-sized regions, in these examples two, four, and nine web pages being displayed, respectively. Displaying 5 webpages per Rodefer's suggestion would produce an annoyingly inconsistent arrangement on the screen, and is not workable. Displaying 10 webpages per Rodefer's suggestion can only be

accomplished in a regular manner by displaying two rows where each row is five pages wide, also providing an unwieldy arrangement on the screen.

Accordingly, applicant's claim 9 has been amended to include ", and wherein any displayed webpages are tiled in substantially equal-sized regions within the screen area." Support for this limitation is found in paragraphs 118 and 119 discussing Figures 10 and 11, showing a "function grouping" 1104 wherein the function grouping clearly consists of substantially equal-sized regions.

§103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, and 6

The office action rejected claims 1,2,and 6 under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al. (US Pat No 6,990,494) in view of Smith et al. (US Pat No 6,742,033), and further in view of Rodefer et al. (Pub No 2003/0120779).

Claim 1

The office action recites that Smith teaches "... automatically pre-cache websites during off-peak hours that may then be accessed by a user in the future at a faster speed." This statement is actually in contrast with applicant's invention. Smith teaches that searches historically run by a user may be scheduled to run in off-peak hours and thus be available to the user during peak hours when resources are more limited. As presently claimed applicant's invention is directed towards improving the *user's immediate experience*, and as such presently recites that the search request is initiated by the user. While Smith was finding ways to improve performance in the face of *limited* computer and network bandwidth resources, applicant's invention is directed towards improving the user's productivity in light of continually increasing bandwidth resources that existed at the time of filing and that applicant anticipated would continue to increase significantly in the future.

Applicant's invention facilitates higher performance and convenience for new searches, not historical searches run automatically in "off hours" as Smith discusses. Applicant's invention is forward-looking, taking advantage of improvements in computer performance to offer a new level of convenience and time-saving enhancements to the user. As stated in paragraph [0028] in the instant application (emphasis added), searches like those described by Smith would fall into the category of a prior art paradigm stemming from an age where network and Internet bandwidth was limited and costly:

"[0028] There are multiple inherent problems in using a prior art web browser-search engine paradigm for information retrieval and display, **stemming from an age where Network and Internet bandwidth was limited and costly.**

Better solutions are needed that remove the foregoing web browser and search engine deficiencies, **given the greater processor power** measured in millions of instructions per second (MIPS) and Internet access bandwidth measured in millions of bits per second (Mbps/sec.) **available today**, while providing a tighter integration between the web browser and search engine(s)."

Applicant's invention does not rely on running a historical search during off hours and as such, claim 1 has been amended to state: "wherein said search request is initiated by the user and is not initiated automatically during off hours based on historical searching patterns of the user". Since searches according to Smith are run during off hours, they are therefore initiated automatically by the user's computer. Searches according to applicant's invention are initiated by the user, instead. Support for this user-initiated search limitation is found in applicant's paragraph [0121] and FIG. 13.

As presently claimed, the current invention directly teaches away from Smith. For the reasons explained above, Smith is about minimizing network use by scheduling downloads during a time when the user is not initiating any network requests. The currently-claimed invention takes the exact opposite approach – as presently claimed, the system does *nothing* while the user is away, while *increasing* network use while the

user is present. In order to function, the instant invention must disregard Smith's teaching about minimizing network use.

Claims 2 and 6

Applicant's invention goes beyond loading pages referenced by links returned by a search engine as described by Rodefer. Applicant's paragraph 139 and figure 19 depict:

"...an IRDS directed web browser Descendant Webpage Preloading method. Descendant pages 1906, 1907, and 1908 are pointed to by hyperlinks 1903, 1904, and 1905 respectively that reside on webpages that have already been preloaded into a webpage queue 1902 or computer memory. Descendant pages are preloaded into computer memory, a queue, or web browser 1901 objects that are not visible until requested by the web browser 1901 to be displayed on demand. A user selecting hyperlink 1903, 1904, or 1905 on a visible webpage would immediately have the descendant webpage 1906, 1907, or 1908 associated with such hyperlink 1903, 1904, or 1905 available and displayed."

Note that in applicant's figure 19 not all preloaded webpages have descendant webpages loaded. This is due to the statistical reality that users will more likely click on a link to a descendant page before they get far down the queue of primary webpages that correspond directly to links returned by the search engine. Thus, applicant has amended claim 2 to read "...and wherein descendant webpages are preloaded for some, but not all, of said selectable number of webpages.", and claim 6 to read "...and wherein descendant webpages are preloaded for some, but not all, of said predetermined number of webpages." Nothing in Smith or Bates suggest these features of the system.

Claim 22

Claim 22 was rejected in the office action for reasons similar to claims 1 and 9. Applicant has amended claim 22 to emphasize that a search initiated by the user is being performed:

"..., wherein said search request is initiated by the user and is not initiated automatically during off hours based on historical searching patterns of the user;"

In addition, claim 22 has been amended to be consistent with the primary paradigm of the instant invention.

The prior-art search paradigm of dealing primarily with (visible) lists of links returned by a search engine is replaced in the instant invention with the paradigm of dealing with fully operable multiple webpage windows. Note that applicant's figures 9 through 12 do not show the list of search result as merely links. Only button 921 is shown in figure 9 which is described as a control input (paragraph 117, line 5: "...inputs may be entered...") to "...list 921 the current hyperlink queue..." As such, applicant has described a paradigm where the default condition is to NOT display the hyperlink queue returned by a search engine and instead shows the results directly in multiple webpage windows per applicant's figures 9 through 12. Per the instant invention, the user would press a button if they desire to view the list of links, the expectation being that they would normally prefer to view the multiple windows instead. Accordingly, claim 22 has also been amended to include:

"...and wherein said hyperlink list by default is not displayed..."

Further, claim 22 has been amended in a manner similar to claims 2 and 6 with regard to preloading descendant webpages:

"...wherein descendant webpages are preloaded for some, but not all, of said at least two webpages."

Claim 30

Claim 30 was rejected in the office action for reasons similar to claims 1 and 9, plus paragraph 37 in Rodefer which mentions simultaneously submitting a search request to multiple Internet search engines.

Paragraph 37] in Rodefer states:

"[0037] The program allows for multiple target sources to be searched simultaneously for the entered search criteria, thus opening multiple windows, each with results from a specific target location (examples: Yahoo, Google, CNN News, Ebay, spell check, company client database, or user's computer)."

Note that Rodefer discloses " ...opening multiple windows, each with results from a specific target location..." Thus, Rodefer discloses opening a separate results window for each search engine. Nowhere does Rodefer suggest that the search results should be "aggregated and/or prioritized" before being displayed in multiple windows as required by applicant's claim 30 and as described (emphasis added) in applicant's paragraph 37:

"...Each search engine processes the request and returns a webpage that contains a list of hyperlinks and/or images with hyperlinks. These webpages when communicated back to the enhanced web browser are in a binary format representing text. This format can be used to reconstruct a list of hyperlinks. The lists of hyperlinks returned from one or more search engines can be **aggregated and/or prioritized** by such web browser."

As such, applicant respectfully submits that the suggested combination using Rodefer does not render applicant's claim 30 obvious. In addition, claim 30 has been hereby amended in a manner similar to claims 9 and 22 to clarify that applicant's invention is for

searches that are initiated by the user and NOT for automatically initiated searches that are based on historical searching patterns and run during off hours:

" , wherein said search request is initiated by the user and is not initiated automatically during off hours based on historical searching patterns of the user"

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, define allowable subject matter and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued. If the Examiner feels that a telephonic interview will expedite allowance, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided. Claims 1-2, 6-10, 16-17, 19, 21-31, and 33 were rejected and are currently pending. Claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 22, and 30 are amended.

Dated: August 30, 2010

Respectfully submitted,
CHERSKOV & FLAYNIK

/Szymon M. Gurda/

Szymon M. Gurda
Reg. No. 58,451